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Reviewer's report:

RE. COMMENTS ON MINUSCRIPT TITLED “HEALTH- FACILITY BASED ACTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE THIRD STAGE OF LABOUR: FINDINGS FROM A NATIONAL SURVEY IN TANZANIA (S.G Mfinanga et al)”

A) GENERAL COMMENTS

1) By and large the authors has a grasp of what is required in a scientific research

2) The general lay out is fine except a few corrections that will require Minor Essential Revisions

B) COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS

1) THE TITLE. The title is appropriate and conveys what has been studied

2) THE ABSTRACT. Structured as it should be and contains adequate information about the study. Save for a few grammatical mistakes i.e. paragraph 1. The authors may wish to add a sentence for recommendations

3) THE BACKGROUND. Overall there is relevant information for the study. There is also enough justification for the study to be undertaken

4) OBJECTIVES. The questions posed by the authors are well defined. The information targeted through these objectives was useful though not new.

5) METHODS. The methods are appropriate but limited description .The authors should have pointed out the limitations of their study, the correction of which would make the findings and the discussion more informative. It is not stated whether there was ethical clearance obtained from the relevant authorities before the study was undertaken. Information on data management is also limited. How was the data analyzed? What statistical program was used?etc. Description of some terms could have appeared in this section and not in the results section.
I.e. the researchers' CCT definition, AMTSL A & B definitions, pre/in service midwives and physicians etc. These Minor Essential Revisions on this section would make the reading easier and more interesting.

6) RESULTS. The data are fairly presented and address the objectives of the study but a few Minor Essential Corrections need to be dealt. For example, the statement that begins with “This is in contrast to FIGO/ICM…….”on the last paragraph of page 6 sounds to be a discussion point and does not reflect the findings from this study. Also the last paragraph on the elements of AMTLS which begins with” The percentage of deliveries …… “on page 7 can be merged with the findings on the use of uterotonic drugs on the last paragraph of page 6

7) DISCUSSION. Satisfactory.
Again, I can not avoid thinking this study had a number of limitations which could be discussed here for relevancy of the findings. The proposal statement to the MoHSW on paragraph 3 page 9 should be placed on the recommendation section

8) CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. This section needs Minor Essential Revisions. The major conclusions should be clearly highlighted instead of vague statements. The study has made important revelations which need solid recommendations for health policy makers

9) REFERENCES. Satisfactory

REVIEWER’S FINAL REMARK
The paper adheres to the relevant standards of reporting and data deposition. I therefore recommend it for publication provided the above editorial errors and revisions are implemented.

DR ABEL MAKUBI
Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS)
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

What next?
----------------------
I accept the manuscript to be published after minor essential revisions as it appears in my general reviews

Level of interest
The article is of importance in its field

Quality of written English

Acceptable

Statistical review

Acceptable as I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests

I declare that I have no competing interests in this manuscript

Thanks
Dr Abel Makubi

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.